



ARGU

AMERICAN RIGHTS GUARDIAN UPDATE

VOLUME 7 NUMBER 2 SPRING 2002

The only printed voice of opposition to Federal Government Indian Policy in Wisconsin

Published by Protect Americans' Rights and Resources to maintain an informed membership

So, here we go, once again the tribes are using the ceded territory, court awarded, off reservation treaty rights apparently to intimidate the State of Wisconsin. Wisconsin Indian Tribes are pressing for 30-year gambling compacts; consequently, walleye bag limits will be imposed on 282 lakes in northern Wisconsin this year, eight more than in 2001. In addition, the number of lakes with daily hook-and-line limits of three walleyes per day will drop from 132 last year to 91. Another 188 lakes will have two walleyes per day as a bag limit, and three lakes will have a daily limit of one walleye per day.

The idiotic, so-called 50-50 split negotiated by the DNR, is so flawed that the Indians can declare the maximum amount of walleyes out of premier lakes (while avoiding lesser producing lakes) forcing 1,2 or zero fish bag limits for non-Chippewa anglers. The following article "Tribes Seeking 30 Year Compacts", will explain the reason for the reduced bag limits.

In this Issue

On this Page: Tribes Seeking 30 Year Compacts. How the tribes put the squeeze on the state.

On Page 2: Negative Aspects of Gambling Ignored in Rush to Expand.

On Page 3: Indians Lobby Supreme Court Justice

On Page 3: Fan Mail, PARR responds to ridicules chastising.

On Page 3: Tribal Sovereign Immunity is a Myth. A look at the ridiculousness of tribal sovereignty claims by John Fleming

On Page 4: The Ant and the Grasshopper (The Classic Version)

On Page 5: Americans for Gun safety. Exposure of who actually funds anti gun group.

On Page 5: Concealed Carry Falls in Senate. The sandbagging of Senator Zein's concealed carry law.

On Page 6: Wisconsin Non-Tribal Folk's Hunting & Fishing... Right or Privilege?

On Page 7: Queer Way to Spend our Tax Dollars. Al Gore rains 1/2 Million tax \$ on gay community.

On Page 7: The Whitewash of Korean War Veterans Exposed.

On Page 8: Double Standard. Elaine Willman provides an insight on Indian Drug Use.

On Page 9: The winner of this year's renewal drawing of the print "Shoulda Been There."

Tribes Seeking 30 Year Compacts

A study commissioned by the United Tribes of Wisconsin and conducted by Michael K. Evans, chairman of Evans, Carroll & Associates, an economic consulting and forecasting firm in Boca Raton, Fla., says Wisconsin's casinos are hindered by restrictions on the games permitted by the current compacts and the inability to secure long-term financing for improvements. Casino gambling revenue in Wisconsin would increase by at least 50% and would generate an extra \$50 million per year in tax revenue for the state if the casinos secured 30-year compacts, according to a recent study. No doubt the reason for this study (probably paid for with tax dollars) is a propaganda ploy in an attempt to get longer periods of time on their compacts. Can you imagine how many politicians they could buy in 30 years? The Tribes buying politicians, "far fetched" you say. Not at all; the Federal Election Commission (FEC) has ruled that Tribal Governments are not subject to the same limits on campaign contributions as individuals and non-governmental groups.

The study comes on the heels of a month long advertising campaign by some of the state tribes that called for the extension of the compacts that expire next year.

State officials have not given a formal response to the request to reopen the compacts but have indicated that they would want to renegotiate rather than simply renew the pacts. Let's hope the state negotiators don't give 30 years away for nothing. Thirty years ought to be worth the Ceded Territory treaty rights. Of course, they aren't worth much anymore considering the diminished fisheries.

"Wisconsin's Indian gaming facilities are simply not competitive

with their neighbors," said Evans, who has been a professor of economics at Northwestern University and the University of Pennsylvania. "They fall way behind the competition."

The Evans study says Wisconsin ranks last among 12 states in the study, with average income revenue from slot machines \$150 a day. Slots in Iowa make \$174 a day; Minnesota's slots make \$156 a day; and Illinois' \$442 a day. Since blackjack is the only table game allowed under the current compacts, Wisconsin's tables also make the least amount of money, \$845 daily, of the 12 states. The next lowest on the list are Missouri's tables, which earn \$1,033 a day; the highest are Nevada's, at \$3,675 a day.

Wisconsin doesn't have as large a market to tap for casinos as Nevada (25 million people counting the state's population and 2/3 of California's population) or New Jersey (17 million); it does have 8 million customers available, estimated by counting Wisconsin's population and 40% of the Chicago metropolitan area, the study says. So, does this mean that the taxpayers of Wisconsin will have to make up the difference?

The lack of long-term financing prevents Wisconsin casinos from making improvements that would put them on par with the more extravagant Nevada casinos, according to the study. Perhaps the sovereign nation status that the Tribes use as a ploy to avoid paying their bills could have more of an impact on their inability to obtain loans than the lack of long term compacts.

The new \$120 million Potawatomi Bingo Casino in Menomonee Valley that opened in October 2000 created nearly five times the space of the old casino, but it's still smaller than Nevada operations.

State Sen. Bob Welch (R-Redgranite) says casino gambling harms Wisconsin's economy more than it helps. "It raises money by taking from other industries, and I don't just mean other entertainment businesses, but from people's mortgage payments and children's college funds,"

Welch said in an interview. "It is a net social loss for the state." Welch said he doesn't doubt that longer modified compacts would increase the casinos' profitability, but he would prefer that the tribes open other tourist enterprises, like golf courses and hotels.

PARR Ed Note: Did you notice that the theme of this "we need 30 year compacts" is that somehow the State of Wisconsin is short changing the Tribes, because their casinos aren't on a par with Nevada's. What Tribes have to offer is not in the same league with Nevada, and with 100-year compacts, it is doubtful if they will ever catch up. The irony of all this jockeying for position is: By the end of May we will find that the actual amount of fish slaughtered will be a small percentage of the declarations. Every year the same game; Why???

\$\$\$\$\$\$

Negative Aspects of Gambling Ignored in Rush to Expand

(Author Unknown)

Lately there has been a great deal of television ads appealing to individuals to let state legislators know that they are in favor of extending compacts for gambling in Wisconsin. The ads say that gambling in the state has had a beneficial impact on the economy, and has contributed to 30,000 new jobs in Wisconsin, but a closer look at the total effects of gambling is in order before deciding if the industry is truly beneficial.

We need to look at what effect gambling has on other businesses as well as personal lives to see a more realistic picture of the social costs involved.

There is not enough room in this column to address the devastating effect gambling has on the individuals and families of those who are vulnerable to the highly addictive nature of gambling. The following facts barely scratch the surface. But a short study of two well-known areas with a longer history of legalized gambling casts great doubt on the benefits of the industry.

In 1996, the National Gambling Impact Study Commission was approved by Congress to evaluate gambling in all of its forms. The panel was given two years to study the impact of this industry on the economy, families, and those who become addicted to it. A final report was issued in 1999. The commission studied Nevada, which legalized gambling in 1931.

Consider these documented facts: When compared with the other 49 states, Nevada ranks first in the nation in suicide. First in divorce, first in high school drop-outs, first in homicide against women, first in gambling addictions, third in bankruptcies, third in abortion, fourth in rape, fourth in out-of-wedlock births, fourth in alcohol related deaths, fifth in crime and sixth in the number of prisoners incarcerated. It ranks in the top one-third of the nation in child abuse, and dead last in voter participation.

Also, take a look at Atlantic City, New Jersey. The unemployment rate there is almost three times the national average (12.7 percent at the time of the report, January 1999). Casinos light up the main thoroughfare of the city, while a block or two on either side is filled with vacant land where businesses used to stand. More than 200 restaurants have gone broke since the arrival of the casinos. Dry cleaners and specialty shops have disappeared.

In a 1994 article, Donald Trump, owner of the Taj Mahal in Atlantic City, was quoted as saying, "People will spend a tremendous amount of money in casinos, money that they would normally spend on buying a refrigerator or a new car. Local business will suffer because they'll lose customer dollars to the casinos." That is the true legacy of gambling. In this light, gambling doesn't appear to be a boon to the economy

One more item worth mentioning is the enormous power and influence held by the gambling industry. With nearly unlimited financial resources they can dramatically influence elections and entice political leaders to do their bidding.

(Negative Continued From Page 2)

Leaders of both parties have accepted huge campaign contributions. In all, more than 13 million dollars had been contributed to political campaigns nationally before 1999, totaling \$6.1 million to Republicans and \$7.6 million to Democrats. No special interest group should ever be given such power over the electoral and legislative process.

The Gambling Commission's report, which was unanimously adopted, called for a moratorium on gambling expansion. This is especially noteworthy because four of the nine commissioners on the panel actually represented or endorsed gambling industry interests. The commission concluded, "Gambling, like other viable businesses, creates both profits and jobs. However, the real question—the reason gambling is in need of substantially more study—is not simply how many people work in the industry, or how much they earn, and not what tax revenues flow from gambling. The central issue is whether the net increases in income and well being are worth the acknowledged social costs of gambling."

§§§§§§

Indians Lobby Supreme Court Justice

(By Bob Marzke)

Recently, according to the Milwaukee Journal/Sentinel, Supreme Court justice Stephen Breyer told American Indian leaders they may be better off asking Congress to solve questions of tribal sovereignty before taking their chances before the nation's highest court. Breyer said cases involving very complex set of issues" (read mucho campaign wampum) and that justices might appreciate input from lawmakers. "If you can figure out an approach, and if Congress begins to act, then when cases come to us we can approach them with the informed opinion of Congress," Breyer told a conference of the National Congress of American Indians. "I can't say it makes a difference in every case, but in most cases it makes a huge tribal difference," he said.

Page 3

Breyer's advice comes as leaders are re-evaluating legal strategy after losing two high profile Supreme Court cases in 2001. **PARR Ed Note:** In essence Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer told the Indians: Go out and buy yourself (a bunch of politicians) and bingo (no pun intended) just like that, you'll control the country. Now the reason for the 30-year compacts becomes more apparent.

I didn't think one could lobby Supreme Court Justices. Maybe just those who bought themselves alleged Sovereignty are worthy.

Fan Mail

(PARR Board Editorial)

This literary gem was sent to PARR's web site from an Indian Casino:

"PARR, I would like to know where your ancestry came from. It was not from the United States. When Columbus came to this country, he discovered only one people—Native Americans—This country belongs to the Native Americans and Native Americans only. Who do you think you are? Go back to your own country."

If all Caucasians left; most Indian reservations would be empty, and secondly it's doubtful if casinos would do very well in the Stone Age.

Why the Stone Age? White man brought agriculture, industry, electricity and just a few other basics that allow Indians to roll around in BMMs playing DVDs, pick up their electronically generated "per-capita" checks monthly, while screaming for preservation of their culture and tradition.

No white man on this continent? No conveniences long embraced by Native Americans. The hypocrisy of screaming for yesterday's lifestyle while milking the very best that this country's technology can provide (slot machines do not grow in the ground), is an abomination.

In all our combined education in history, we've yet to read or hear of Native American ancestors, nomadically transporting slot machines on poles behind horses. Where would tribal life and economy be, absent of all that has been provided by the U.S. government, its taxpay-

ing citizens and the innovations over 225 years? Yep, the Stone Age.

According to historical record Indians originated in Asia as "Mongoloids." Recent discoveries tell us that Central European people were in this country centuries before the Mongoloid, so accordingly the Caucasians are the real Native Americans. Jeff Benedict has completed an extensive investigation and research project, and will soon be publishing a factual account on "Kennewick Man," confirming this information.

Most citizens of this country, regardless of their heritage, from Indians to Chinese, consider themselves Americans first and don't find it necessary to depend on their heritage to make it from one day to the next. Of course, there are exceptions, and the writer of this "fan mail" is likely to be one.

TRIBAL SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY IS A MYTH

(By John A. Fleming)

It is only a creation of the Federal Government without Constitutional Authority. For years, our media, both national and local, has reported on event after event where individuals damaged by or through an incident involving a federally recognized tribe, could not sue the tribe for damages because the tribe claimed sovereign immunity from suit. Tribal sovereignty really is the issue when you think about it and it was the federal government that created and continues to sponsor sovereignty for the federally recognized tribes through the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act, and the Congresses subsequent questionable behavior. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the Indian Civil Rights Act could not be interpreted to authorize a lawsuit against a tribe or its officers in the federal courts (Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez, 1978). It was this case that provided Justice Byron White an opportunity to write in his dissent of this case. . .

"Given Congress' concern about the deprivations of Indian rights by tribal

(Continued See Sovereign Immunity Page 4)

authorities, I cannot believe, as does the majority, that it desired the enforcement of these rights to be left up to the very tribal authorities alleged to have violated them. In the case of the Santa Clara Pueblo, for example, both legislative and judicial powers are vested in the same body, the Pueblo Council." One other part of that dissent deserves space here... "The extension of the Constitutional rights to individual citizens is intended to intrude upon the authority of government."

We are reminded that those constitutional rights given individual citizens were given by the Constitution... **NOT** by the federal or any state government. The Constitution, being a higher authority than those two levels of government, gives rights that cannot be altered, changed or taken away by the lower authorities. Yet you can see, from the above, we have two federal branches that actively control tribes the way they want to and in disregard of the Constitution. Our Executive Branch is equally involved in the above problem area. I hope this discussion about sovereignty was not considered a digression from the immediate subject, sovereign immunity. They both are controlled by the federal government and demonstrate that governments disinterest in following the Constitution.

The Doctrine of Sovereign Immunity does not exist in law or in fact. Rather, it first appeared in 1793, when Chief Justice Jay, in a statement not related to the case at issue before him, refused to hear that case because "There is no power which the courts can call to their aid". He refused the case against the U.S. because of the general rule that a sovereign cannot be sued in his own courts. This case was followed in 1821, by a case where Chief Justice Marshall also refused to hear a case saying "the universally received opinion is that no suit can be commenced or prosecuted against the U. S." Then Marshall continued saying the U.S. is "not suable of common right, the party who institutes such suit must bring his case

within the authority of some act of Congress, or the court cannot exercise jurisdiction over it."

Therefore, we have two Chief Justices that on their own denied citizens the right to sue the U.S. Government using a doctrine stemming from the feudal system our forefathers left in England and totally rejected as observed simply by reading the Declaration of Independence. Then read the Articles of Confederation and our current Constitution; you will not find any authority delegated to the Congress Assembled or the U.S. Government that even remotely could be considered authority to give tribes sovereignty and or sovereign immunity and indeed, there is no authority to have such doctrines in our jurisprudence.

Our form of sovereignty is unique in the world... It is vested in the citizens of each of the States of our union. Sovereign immunity is so incongruous and inconsistent with the concept of a government " by the people and for the people" that it is no wonder this doctrine that does not allow the king to be sued has never had any existence and never should have any place in our system of jurisprudence.

Since the two cases refused by Jay and Marshall, and this was by dictum, the doctrine of sovereign immunity has been thrust upon our citizenry by sheer political and bureau power with no base or validity at all except through the improper use of stare decisis (the doctrine of precedent). In simple terms, sovereign immunity was never granted to the United States by the people and therefore was reserved by the citizens to themselves. Amendment IX and Amendment X assure us of this power being retained in the citizens.

§§§§§§

Issue Item

A major flaw (a.k.a. "loophole") in the much publicized reform of "soft" money contributions to America's federal political campaigns was being exposed by two taxpayer-property issue groups, United Property Owners and Citizens Standup Committee. No reference is made in the proposed reform legislation

to "Indian Tribes." The Federal Elections Commission (FEC) allows Indian tribes to make their federal campaign contributions with government funds. Writes Ed Zuckerman, editor of PACS & Lobbies Newsletter: This "is the only exemption to the federal election law's fundamental requirement that **ALL** money used in federal elections must be derived from the voluntary contributions of individual U.S. citizens. . . . The FEC ruling, based on an expansive misinterpretation of "sovereignty," allows Indian tribes, as such, extraordinary special treatment that is not available to any U.S. citizen. Since tribal governments are subsidized by U.S. tax dollars converted to Congressional appropriations, the FEC ruling would, in effect, permit them to support candidates with general taxpayer funds.

§§§§§§

THE ANT AND THE GRASSHOPPER (THE CLASSIC VERSION)

The ant works hard in the withering heat all summer long, building his house and laying up supplies for the winter. The grasshopper thinks he's a fool, and laughs, dances and plays the summer away.

Come winter, the ant is warm and well fed. The grasshopper has no food or shelter so he dies out in the cold.

(THE 2002 VERSION)

The ant works hard in the withering heat all summer long, building his house and laying up supplies for the winter. The grasshopper thinks he's a fool, laughs, and dances and plays the summer away.

Come winter, the shivering grasshopper calls a press conference, demands to know why the ant should be allowed to be warm, and well fed while others are cold and starving. CBS, CNN, NBC and ABC show up to provide pictures of the shivering grasshopper next to video of the ant in his comfortable home with a table filled with food. America and the world are stunned by the sharp contrast.

How can it be that, in a country of such
(Ant & Grasshopper continued see Page 5)

(Ant & Grasshopper Continued From Page 4)
wealth, this poor grasshopper is allowed to suffer so?

Then a representative of the NAGB (National Association of Green Bugs) shows up on Nightline and charges the ant with "green bias," and makes the case that the grasshopper is the victim of 30 million years of greenism. Kermit the Frog appears on Oprah with the grasshopper, and everybody cries when he sings "It's Not Easy Being Green."

Bill and Hillary Clinton make a special guest appearance on the CBS Evening News to tell a concerned Dan Rather that they will do everything they can for the grasshopper who has been denied the prosperity he deserves by those who benefited unfairly during the Reagan summers, or as Bill refers to it, the "Temperatures of the 80's."

Richard Gephardt exclaims in an interview with Peter Jennings that the ant has gotten rich off the back of the grasshopper, and calls for an immediate tax hike on the ant to make him pay his "fair share."

Finally, the EEOC drafts the "Economic Equity and Anti-Greenism Act." Retroactive to the beginning of the summer, the ant was fined for failing to hire a proportionate number of green bugs and, having nothing left to pay his retroactive taxes the government confiscates his home.

The story ends as we see the grasshopper finishing up the last bits of the ant's food while the government house he's in, which just happens to be the ant's old house, crumbles around him since he doesn't know how to maintain it. The ant has disappeared in the snow. And the image on the TV, which the grasshopper bought by selling most of the ant's food, is of Bill Clinton standing before a wildly applauding group of compatriots announcing that a new era of "fairness" has dawned in America.

PARR Ed Note: The above was printed with the permission of Newsmax.com.

\$\$\$\$\$\$

Americans for Gun Safety

(By Michael S. Brown a member of Doctors for Sensible Gun Laws)

An organization calling itself "Americans for Gun Safety" has financed a wave of radio ads, currently running in selected cities, that claim gun shows are a source of weapons for foreign terrorists. Listeners are urged to pressure Congress to fix this allegedly urgent problem. These radio spots are deceptive political attack ads, like those we complain about at election time. It takes only a moment's thought to recall that terrorists have numerous sources of armaments that are vastly superior in price, quality and selection to what can be obtained at American gun shows.

Today's real terrorist threat does not even involve guns. Terror bombers use explosives and hijackers use improvised weapons like box cutters. We are also concerned with weapons of mass destruction, which certainly do not come from gun shows.

The strategy behind this strange series of ads can only be understood by looking at the reality of Americans for Gun Safety (AGS). The important questions to ask are how many members have joined this organization, where does their money come from, and what is their interest in gun safety?

The answer to the first question is easy. There are no members. AGS is a front organization for billionaire Andrew McKelvey, who likes to spend his money influencing public opinion.

As far as I can tell, they have not sponsored a single gun safety or hunter's education class. All of their money goes into anti-gun advertising, other anti-gun organizations, or to support political candidates who are cozy with McKelvey.

The basic premise of AGS is therefore a deception. It is simply a unit of the anti-gun lobby operating under a false flag.

There are logical reasons why the anti-gun lobby has chosen to attack gun shows. First, they are an easy target. Only a small percentage of people have attended a gun show, so it is easy to inaccurately portray them as havens for

criminals and terrorists.

Perhaps even more important, gun shows offer fundraising and outreach opportunities for gun rights organizations. By attacking gun shows, AGS strikes at the heart of their enemy.

Unfortunately, for AGS, attacks on gun shows have lost momentum since a government study revealed that only seven tenths of one percent of criminals obtained their guns from gun shows. This may be why they are stretching the truth in a desperate attempt to link gun shows with terrorists.

As with all political attack ads, the reality does not match the rhetoric. In addition, the story behind the ads is more interesting than the ads themselves. Radio listeners would be well advised to do their own research and make up their own minds.

PARR Ed Note: Regardless of how much gun control the gun-grabbers manage to get legislated, nothing will change, because the gun is not the problem. This was graphically hammered home in Germany, recently.

Germany has some of the toughest gun control laws in the world, but that didn't stop a gunman from opening fire in an Erfurt school, killing 18 people and wounding six.

In an eerie echo of the U.S.'s own Columbine massacre three years ago, one Erfurt student told the Associated Press: "I heard shooting and thought it was a joke. But then I saw a teacher dead in the hallway in front of Room 209 and a gunman in black carrying a weapon."

How could this have happened in a country where private gun ownership has been virtually outlawed?

\$\$\$\$\$\$

Concealed Carry Falls in Senate

(Thanks to Wisconsin Outdoor News Dean Bortz Editor)

Senate leaders used an outdated procedural challenge to sandbag Sen. Dave Zien's attempt to get his concealed carry bill heard on Tuesday, March 12, the last night of session. "Phones are ringing off the hook. The public is incensed," said

(Continued See carry Page 6)

Zien (R-Eau Claire).

Zien's personal protection bill, Senate Bill 357, died when Senate majority leader Sen. Chuck Chvala (D-Madison) and Senate president Sen. Fred Risser (D-Madison) stymied the late interest in Zien's bill. At one point, Chvala called Zien out of order, based on Senate Rule 8, an old rule that requires senators to wear suit coats and forbids them from drinking and smoking on the floor.

"I asked why we were out of order, and they said we were in violation of Rule 8. We were in proper attire. We certainly weren't smoking or drinking. I asked how that rule related to us being out of order and they said the Senate president would have to rule on that point of order the next day. Well, we were out of session the next day," Zien said. "They knew we had the votes, they knew we had the law, they did not want citizens, women, and the elderly to be protected. They shoved this down our throats," Zien said.

While Zien did not blame Democratic Senators for not speaking up and asking their leaders for a vote that night, the following day, National Rifle Association (NRA) officials placed Wisconsin's November election at the top of its priority list, officials said. "I believe we had 20 to 21 votes, and there were a number of Democratic senators who would have voted for it, but their leaders never gave them a chance," Zien said.

Republicans accused Chvala, Risser and Sen. Rodney Moen (D-Whitehall) of using arbitrary floor procedures to block the measure. Democrats now control the Wisconsin Senate 18 to 15 over Republicans. Although Zien said, he's only pointing fingers at the three leaders, Chvala, Risser and Moen, he said he couldn't figure out why other senators didn't speak up. "The bill just makes sense," Zien said. "We save lives, we cut crime, we save money in the court systems. The people in the galleries that night were horrified with what they saw. We had 2,000 people listening on-line — that's a state record for the Senate.

Issue Item

The Maryland Court of Appeals ruled 6-1 that gun maker Sturm, Ruger & Company could not be held accountable for the 1999 death of Jordan Garris, who died after discovering his father's gun and shooting himself. The court sided with common sense, that the manufacturer had nothing to do with the father's decision about storage of the firearm.

As Maryland's high court found, "this tragic accident was caused by the failure of a firearm's owner to act in a safe and responsible manner by following the most basic firearms safety messages and warnings provided to him by the manufacturer and the retailer that sold him the firearm."

§§§§§§

Issue Item

Every morning a devout old lady stepped out on her front stoop and raised her arms to the sky and proclaimed "Glory be to God on High." At the same time the atheist that lived next door came out and told her to shut up adding, "there is no God."

This was a daily occurrence, until one day the devout old lady added, Lord I'm hungry and need groceries, to her usual worship.

The next day the devout old lady stepped on to the stoop and there stood two bags of groceries, so, she raised her arms to the sky and proclaimed "Glory be to God on High." The atheist next door said "oh shut up there is no God, I bought the groceries." Again, the old lady again raised her arms to heaven and proclaimed "Thank you Lord, you not only provided the groceries, **but you got the devil to pay for them.**"

§§§§§§

Issue Item

Kudos to Congressman Peterson for the courage he has displayed, in introducing this common sense bill. "The Good Neighbor Act," sponsored by Pennsylvania Republican Rep. John Peterson, would halt some central government land grabs in counties where over half the land is already owned by the National Park

Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management or Fish and Wildlife Service.

If enacted, the bill would require the government to buy a piece of land for at least 97 percent of the fair market value of any new land to be acquired. Rep. Peterson notes, "**With Washington already owning one-third of America, we cannot afford to wait any longer to reform the federal government's runaway land acquisition process.**"

A good neighbor doesn't move into your house and take over, especially when they're not invited. But somehow the federal government has no problem moving into a region and taking over without the slightest regard for the people who live there."

§§§§§§

Wisconsin Non-Tribal Folk's Hunting & Fishing.. Right or Privilege?

(By Greg Graunke)

The following (*in italic print*) is from ARGU Volume 6 # 3 Summer 2001.

The article **Tom Maulson Torpedoes Tribe's Effort to Gain Respect** included the irritating Maulson quote "**for non-natives, fishing is a privilege and for Native Americans, it is a right.**"

Recently the fourth annual Gathering of the Guides at the Lake of the Torches Casino in Lac du Flambeau was held. Lake of the Torches has been sponsoring a fun day in which 20 fishing guides; both native and non-native, take out 40 members of the media, DNR, state government and guests from the private sector

.At noon, all the guides took their crews back to Lake of the Torches for a shore lunch and several speakers. That's when Tom Maulson, former tribal chairman for the Lac du Flambeau, had his turn to speak. Maulson began by reminding us that. "for non-natives, fishing is a privilege and that for Native Americans, it is a right." Next, he pointed to the casino and told the crowd that without "gaming," no one would have been present for this Outing.

Mr. Maulson's statement so aggravated me, that I wrote our New Governor a letter, requesting his views on this subject. The following is the Governor's interesting reply. I want to point out that it took the better part of a year to reply to my letter. Probably a lot of research was necessary.

Dear Mr. Graunke

Thank you for your letter concerning Mr. Maulson's statements regarding fishing and hunting rights. I appreciate the time you took to contact my office and your patience in waiting for response.

Over the years, Mr. Maulson has on numerous occasions made statements that State officials, including myself, do not necessarily agree with. His statement that hunting and fishing are privileges for non-Indians and rights for tribal members is also a statement the residents of the State of Wisconsin may disagree with.

Most citizens in Wisconsin view hunting and fishing as an activity of such importance to them that their ability to participate seems like it should be one of their basic rights. However, the courts have viewed hunting and fishing by non-Indians not as a right, but as a privilege. This interpretation by the courts is one of the reasons why the Legislature has proposed a constitutional amendment creating a constitutional right to hunt and fish. As you may know, I support this amendment.

I would note that just because hunting and fishing is a privilege as a matter of state law that does not necessarily mean a treaty right supersedes State interests in every instance. The Federal courts have recognized that the resources in Wisconsin subject to a treaty right are shared resources and the right versus privilege distinction has to date played no meaningful role in how these resources have been allocated.

Thank you again for taking the time to contact my office.

Sincerely, Scott McCallum Governor

End Note: In 2001 Senate Joint Resolu

tion 2 (SJR 2) which relates to amending the Wisconsin State Constitution to provide that the people have the right to fish, hunt, trap and take game subject only to reasonable restrictions as prescribed by law, passed the Assembly and Senate

As with all amendments to the State Constitution, this resolution must be passed by two consecutive sessions of the Legislature before ratification by the voters in a statewide election. Therefore, it must be introduced and pass both houses of the Legislature during the next Legislative Session, which begins January 2003. As a result, the earliest this amendment could be voted on by the people of Wisconsin would be in April of 2004.

PARR urges every one of you citizens of Wisconsin to contact your elected officials and explain that it would behoove them to vote for the second proposal of . . . 2 (SJR 2) so the paying citizens of Wisconsin become the equal of the beneficiary.

§§§§§§

Queer Way to Spend our Tax Dollars

Because PARR is accused of being politically incorrect in our assessment of Federal Indian Policy, many consider our thinking as unusual. Then by using the criteria established below, PARR should meet the standards needed to qualify as queer and be eligible for bushel baskets full of tax-dollars.

When he was running for president, Vice President Al Gore personally delivered a \$500,000 government check to a San Francisco gay and transgender center that sponsors events such as the "Queer Youth-A-Palooza," a "Drag King Junior Contest" and a "Leather Pride Reception."

Questioned by Fox News Channel's Bill O'Reilly, gay activist Jeff Sheehy said that the "Queer Youth-A-Palooza" was "kind of like a prom event" with "a bunch of queer kids." He further explained that the "Drag King Junior Contest" featured "girls dressing up like Elvis Presley." The center's \$7 million cost is mostly

paid for by state and local taxes. However, in 2000, the Clinton administration approved a \$500,000 grant.

PARR Ed. Note: One has to ask the question: Is this group a high priority, a worthy recipient of our tax dollars? I don't think so, considering the fact that, under the Clinton administration, families in the military had to apply for food stamps in order to live.

Oh, by the way Gore carried California in the last presidential election. Does that indicate that people who benefited from Gore's bribe, of taxpayer dollars, dominate California's population?

§§§§§§

Issue Item

It appears that a high level of scientific research was used as a tool to determine alleged dangers to the environment that the Crandon Mine project will cause.

According to the Milwaukee Journal/Sentinel, former Natural Resources Secretary George Meyer said that over lunch three years ago, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Chvala told him to block the Crandon mine or the Senate would not vote to confirm Meyer's cabinet appointment. "Basically, I recall him saying, 'I want you to stop the mine,'" Meyer said in an interview. Both men are lawyers, and Meyer said he would have broken the law had he done what Chvala wanted.

Only in Wisconsin where the highest taxes in the country are paid, can one arrogant politician, who assumes he has the power of a king, attempt something like this.

The Whitewash of Korean War Veterans

Exposed

(By Bob Marzke)

The following is part of an article that appeared in ARGU Volume 4 # 5 fall 1999. Following that is the exposure of the basis, for the implications that U.S. soldiers slaughtered hundreds of civilians, as counterfeit.

The United States lost more than 35,000 servicemen during the Korean War, and 50 years later, a few citizens of

(Continued See Exposed Page 9*)

(Exposed Continued From Page 7)

Korea are claiming that some of their innocent loved ones, who were refugees, were gunned down by American soldiers in a place called No Gun Ri.

Now the liberal mainstream media again begins disclaiming the sacrifices and accomplishments of previous generations. With a weeklong series of daily articles, they voice their suspicions of a cover-up by the Pentagon. They apologize over the need for an investigation of alleged war crimes in Korea over 50 years ago. They regret the lack of an international war crimes court to investigate. Is anyone naive enough to believe that any Americans standing trial for these alleged "war crimes" would get a fair shake from the North Koreans and Chinese whom no doubt would be on this International tribunal. Clinton would make sure of that.

I would like to ask the brave news-service people, responsible for this series of articles, how they would like to live with what they can carry on their back for weeks or months at a time. Were they ever scared beyond anything that anyone who wasn't there could ever comprehend, because every moment of every day someone is trying to kill you?

After viewing the bodies of several hundred of your buddies who were taken prisoners, and killed by the North Korean regulars that filtered through your lines as refugees, how would you feel Mr. Editor? Then after taking your buddies prisoner, these same refugees wired their hands behind their backs and shot them in the back of the head. Tell me, Mr. Brave editor, what would you do with the next group of refugees interlaced with North Korean troops?

End 1999 article

Following is what really happened

The controversial Pulitzer Prize winning series by the Associated Press states: "It was a story no one wanted to hear. Early in the Korean War, villagers said, American soldiers machine-gunned hundreds of helpless civilians under a railroad bridge [No Gun Ri] in the South Korean country
Page 8

side." Now there is another story - one the AP doesn't want to hear. It's a new book entitled, "No Gun Ri: A Military History of the Korean War Incident," by former West Point history professor Robert L. Bateman.

In "Military History," Bateman takes relish in quoting the key AP source, Ed Daily, as he emotes from the pages of the award-winning series: "'On summer nights when the breeze is blowing, I can still hear their cries, the little kids screaming,' said Daily, of Clarksville, Tenn., who went on to earn a battlefield commission in Korea."

The ironic truth, of course, is that Daily was never at No Gun Ri and had never been commissioned - painful points first driven home by U.S. News & World Report and the now defunct Stripes.com military news site a few years ago.

Any doubt about Daily's stolen valor was canceled when he admitted his perfidy to prosecutors, who nailed the officer-impostor for fabricating papers that led to the award of medals he never earned, as well as the fraudulent receipt of hundreds of thousands of dollars of VA compensation for phantom combat-related post-traumatic shock.

The AP published its story with Edward Daily, Eugene Hesselman, and Delos Flint at the core...

Examining old military "morning reports," Bateman discovered that reputed AP massacre witness Hesselman had been shot in the foot and evacuated from the scene before the evening of July 26, 1950 when troops of the storied 7th Cavalry had reportedly opened fire on helpless civilians. Similar situation with Flint who, says Bateman, "could not possibly been at No Gun Ri on July 26, 1950 as he had been shot and evacuated the day or night before."

The majority of those present at No Gun Ri on July 26, 1950 denied that the event happened - is never addressed in the story. "Of 130 interviewees, the AP claims that six of these witnessed or participated in the event; that leaves 124 veterans...who did not or were not quote worthy. Six witnesses trump 124 because

obviously those 124 must be hiding something..."

Following through on the numbers game, Bateman looks at a claim by one of the AP authors that more than twenty-four general officers were interviewed.

"This is a remarkable feat," Bateman sneers, "since of the officers from the 7th Cavalry during that period who were still alive in 1997, no more than a handful of those former lieutenants and captains ever made the rank of brigadier general, and none of those men were quoted in the AP story."

PARR Ed Note: The above exposure appeared in Newsmax.com. The article was reduced to accommodate space limitations. Appears that the flower children, of the 60s, who now control the mainstream media, will stop at nothing to justify their own pathetic, selfish, unproductive lives by either trying to change history, or by condemning (with lies) accomplishments of previous generations of Americans.

Why go after the USA for retribution? Unless my memory fails me, in Korea, the United States Army was fighting under the flag of the United Nations.

This writer was a member of the U.S. Army during the Korean War, and I consider this attempt by the liberal mainstream media, to tarnish the integrity of the Korean War GI, a personal insult.

\$\$\$\$\$\$

Double Standard

(By Elaine Wilman Taken From an Article By Ross E. Milloy of The Mirando City Journal)

MIRANDO CITY, Tex. - The South Texas sun beats on the landscape here like an anvil, turkey vultures circle overhead and the scent of distant gas wells drifts across desolate plains of mesquite chaparral and cactus. This is harsh country, but also a land, some say that offers spiritual enlightenment.

Peyote, a small spineless cactus, also grows in Sierra Madre Occidental in Mexico, but its northern range in the United States extends to only a few miles north of here.

"The people around here have been trading peyote with Indians for hundreds

(Continued See Double Standard Page 9)

(Double Standard Continued From Page 8)

of years, so this is nothing new to us," Mr. Johnson, a peyote dealer, said. "We can't cultivate it, that's against the law, but what God produces, we cut." The cactus button, ranging from the size of a quarter to several inches across, contains the powerful hallucinogenic drug mescaline. Although state law and the federal Controlled Substances Act restrict peyote use, there is rarely an enforcement issue locally, Mr. Johnson said.

William Gaspy, now a spokesman for the Drug Enforcement Administration in Washington who was once an agent in South Texas said: "Federal law allows Native Americans to possess peyote for their personal use in religious ceremonies. If we found someone in possession of peyote in personal-use quantities and they could prove that they were a Native American, we kicked them loose."

Blatant hypocrisy-federal and state law enforcement allowing only federally recognized tribes to possess peyote, then simultaneously looking away regarding enforcement."

Until last year, a buyer in Texas had to be at least 25 percent Native American or a member of a tribe to buy the cactus legally. But after state officials received requests involving unknown tribes, the Texas Department of Public Safety began enforcing rules that permit only federally recognized tribes to obtain peyote, said Tela Mange, a spokeswoman for the agency.

Several mornings a week, Mr. Johnson

picks the peyote buttons **from leased ranchland**, (emphasis PARR's) then dries them for days behind his home on wooden racks enclosed in a locked wire-mesh cage, according to federal regulations

. "I move between 300,000 to 500,000 buttons a year out of a total production for the state of about two million buttons," he said.

Today, his customers included a 74-year-old Navajo who had driven all night from Shiprock, N.M., to Mirando City. After checking documents that certified the man as a Native American, Mr. Johnson collected a bucketful of buds and poured them into a burlap bag. He issued a receipt for the peyote and collected \$125. "That's all there is to it," he said of the transaction.

END NOTE: So a "bucket-full" is considered "personal use?" As you read this article, be aware that the U.S. Census Bureau reports 2,475,956 Native Americans in the 2000 Census; however only about 1.2 million are actually enrolled members of federally recognized tribes. Of these, perhaps about 800,000 U.S. Native Americans are of an age to utilize peyote.

If Mr. Johnson is one of six "peyoteros" - there's a substantial quantity of peyote being consumed annually by the adult population of Native Americans. I had no idea they were all that religious!

This article points out one more horrendous "special preference" sanctioned by federal government that authorizes

Native American use of hallucinogenics. So if Indian tribes can use hallucinogenics under the guise of religious practice, does that mean other religions can practice child abuse, pornography, or incest, also under the freedom of religious practices? Do we legalize the illegal just for special interest groups?

PARR Ed Note: And non-Indians get busted and do time for being in possession of a couple of joints. Double Standard. . . you bet.

§§§§§§

PARR Business

Mr. Ronald Jirikowic of Little Chute Wisconsin had his membership application drawn from the hat by my Grandson, so he is now the proud owner of the print "Shoulda Been There." Once again, we thank PERM of Minnesota for supplying the print.

Speaking of renewal **we want to thank all of you who renewed your membership in short order and made such generous donations.** The money was desperately needed. At one time, I sent thank you letters to all who renewed and or donated, but that became too expensive, and time consuming.

Closing Notes: As of press time, everything has been quiet in the Walleye Warriors camp. No word as to how many fish were slaughtered this year. No whining about how they could only spear 30 or 40 percent of the declared amounts.

A new study says that Americans are eating four times more Mexican food than 20 years ago. Well, of course!

There are now four times more Mexicans in the country!

If you are a non-member reader, who has been reading a members copy of ARGU, or a member who hasn't renewed their membership, (check the mailing label, if you are current it will read 03/15/2003) please use the application to the left of this notice to join / renew at this time.

PARR MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION			'01
(PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY)			
NAME(S)			
ADDRESS			
CITY	STATE	ZIP	
PHONE()	DATE		
SINGLE MEMBERSHIP \$15()	FAMILY \$20()		
NEW MEMBER()	RENEWAL()	DONATIONS\$	
FILL OUT AND MAIL ALONG WITH YOUR CHECK TO:			
P.A.R.R.; P.O. BOX 270007; MILWAUKEE, WI. 53227-0007			